arXiv:1304.0805v1 [math.PR] 2 Apr 2013

HITTING TIMES OF RARE EVENTS IN BOUNDARY DRIVEN SYMMETRIC SIMPLE EXCLUSION PROCESSES

O. BENOIS, C. LANDIM, M. MOURRAGUI

Abstract. In the boundary driven symmetric simple exclusion process consider an open set $\mathcal{O}$ of density profiles which does not contain the stationary density profile. We prove that the first time the empirical measure visits the set $\mathcal{O}$ converges to an exponential distribution.

1. Introduction

It has long been observed that in finite-state, reversible Markov processes the hitting time of a rare event is approximately exponentially distributed [26, 13, 2, 3]. For non-reversible dynamics much less is known. By estimating the total variation distance between the stationary measure and the quasi-stationary measure, Aldous [1] proved that the distribution of the hitting time of a rare event is close to an exponential random variable when the mixing time is small compared to the stationary expectation of the hitting time. Fill and Lyzinski [23] proved that starting from the stationary distribution the hitting time of a configuration η can be represented as an independent geometric sum of i.i.d. random variables if the probability of hitting this configuration η at time t starting from η, viz. $p_t(\eta,\eta)$, decreases in time. This representation permits to obtain bounds for the distance between the distribution of the hitting time and the distribution of an exponential random variable. Imbuzeiro [25] proved that the hitting time of a rare event A is approximately exponential starting from a distribution ν if starting from ν the probability of hitting A before the mixing time is small. Fernandez et al. [20] are presently working on this problem in the sequel of [6].

In this article we examine the hitting time of rare events in a well studied non-reversible dynamics, the boundary driven symmetric simple exclusion processes (BDSSEP). Beyond the complications arising from non-reversibility, this model presents a further difficulty in the lack of an explicit formula for the stationary measure. This obstacle is overcome by the use of a large deviations principle to estimate the measure of sets, but prevents us from obtaining bounds for the stationary expectation of the hitting time with errors sharper than exponential.

In the context of interacting particle systems the convergence of hitting times of rare events to exponential random variables has been abundantly investigated. Several results have been obtained for non-conservative dynamics, processes in which the local number of particles changes in time and which lose memory much faster than conservative ones. On the conservative side, which includes the the dynamics examined here, Ferrari et al. [21] considered the case of a totally asymmetric one-dimensional zero-range process, and Ferrari et al. [22] examined the case of the

---

Key words and phrases. hitting times, rare events, non-reversible Markov processes, interacting particle systems.

one-dimensional symmetric simple exclusion process. This latter result was generalized to any dimension and extended to independent random walks by Asselah and Dai Pra [4, 5].

The article is organized as follows. In the next section we state the main result. In Section 3 we present a general method to derive the asymptotic exponentiality of the hitting time of a rare event for finite-state, non-reversible continuous-time Markov processes starting from a measure not too far from the stationary measure in the sense of Lemmas 3.7, 3.8 or 3.9. In Section 4 we estimate the expectation of the hitting time under the stationary state assuming a dynamical large deviations principle. In Section 5 we apply the results presented in the two previous section to the BDSSEP.

2. Notation and Results

The one-dimensional boundary driven symmetric simple exclusion process (BDSSEP). For $N \geq 1$, let $\Lambda_N = \{1, \dots, N-1\}$. Fix $0 < \alpha \leq \beta < 1$ and consider the Markov process $\{\eta^N(t) : t \geq 0\}$ on $\Omega_N = \{0,1\}^{\Lambda_N}$ whose generator L_N is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (L_N f)(\eta) \;&=\; \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x=1}^{N-2} \{ f(\sigma^{x,x+1}\eta) - f(\eta) \} \\ &+\; \frac{1}{2} \Big\{ \alpha[1-\eta(1)] + (1-\alpha)\eta(1) \Big\} \{ f(\sigma^{1}\eta) - f(\eta) \} \\ &+\; \frac{1}{2} \Big\{ \beta[1-\eta(N-1)] + (1-\beta)\eta(N-1) \Big\} \{ f(\sigma^{N-1}\eta) - f(\eta) \} \;. \end{aligned}$$

In this formula, $\eta = \{\eta(x),\, x \in \Lambda_N\}$ is a configuration of the state space $\{0,1\}^{\Lambda_N}$ so that $\eta(x) = 0$ if and only if site x is vacant for η; $\sigma^{x,y}\eta$ is the configuration obtained from η by interchanging the occupation variables $\eta(x)$, $\eta(y)$:

$$(\sigma^{x,y}\eta)(z) \;=\; \begin{cases} \eta(z) & \text{if } z \neq x, y \;, \\ \eta(y) & \text{if } z = x \;, \\ \eta(x) & \text{if } z = y \;; \end{cases}$$

and $\sigma^x\eta$ is the configuration obtained from η by flipping the variable $\eta(x)$:

$$(\sigma^{x}\eta)(z) \;=\; \begin{cases} \eta(z) & \text{if } z \neq x \;, \\ 1-\eta(z) & \text{if } z = x \;. \end{cases}$$

Hence, at rate α (resp. $1-\alpha$) a particle is created (resp. removed) at the boundary site 1 if this site is vacant (resp. occupied). The same phenomenon occurs at the boundary $x = N-1$ with β in place of α.

Denote by $D(\mathbb{R}_+, \Omega_N)$ the Skorohod space of paths from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to Ω_N. Let $\mathbb{P}^N_\eta$, $\eta \in \Omega_N$, be the distribution of the Markov process $\eta^N(t)$ when the initial configuration is η. The probability measure $\mathbb{P}^N_\eta$ is thus a measure on the path space $D(\mathbb{R}_+, \Omega_N)$ endowed with the Skorohod topology. Expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}^N_\eta$ is denoted by $\mathbb{E}^N_\eta$.

The finite state Markov process $\eta^N(t)$ is irreducible and has therefore a unique stationary measure, denoted by $\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}$. The process is reversible if and only if $\alpha = \beta$, in which case the measure $\nu^N_{\alpha,\alpha}$ is a product measure.

The empirical measure. Denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the inner product in $L_2([0,1])$ and set

$$\mathcal{M} := \{\rho \in L_\infty([0,1]) \,:\, 0 \le \rho \le 1\}$$

which we equip with the topology induced by the weak convergence of measures, namely a sequence $\{\rho^n : n \ge 1\} \subset \mathcal{M}$ converges to ρ in $\mathcal{M}$ if and only if $\langle \rho^n, G\rangle \to \langle \rho, G\rangle$ for any continuous function $G : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$. Note that $\mathcal{M}$ is a compact Polish space that we consider endowed with the corresponding Borel σ-algebra.

Let d be a distance in $\mathcal{M}$ compatible with the weak topology,

$$d(\gamma, \gamma') \;=\; \sum_{k\ge 1} \frac{1}{2^k} \left| \langle \gamma, F_k\rangle - \langle \gamma', F_k\rangle \right| \,, \tag{2.1}$$

where the continuous test functions F_k are absolutely bounded by 1.

The empirical density of a configuration $\eta \in \Omega_N$, denoted by $\pi^N(\eta) \in \mathcal{M}$, is defined as

$$\pi^N(\eta) \;:=\; \sum_{x=1}^{N-1} \eta(x)\, \mathbf{1}\big\{ \big[\tfrac{x}{N} - \tfrac{1}{2N}, \tfrac{x}{N} + \tfrac{1}{2N} \big) \big\} \,,$$

where $\mathbf{1}\{A\}$ stands for the indicator function of the set A.

Denote by ∇ the space derivative and by Δ the Laplacian. It has been proved in [16] that under the stationary state $\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}$ the empirical measure π^N converges in probability to the unique solution of the elliptic equation

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\rho = 0 \,, \\ \rho(0) = \alpha \,, \quad \rho(1) = \beta \,. \end{cases}$$

We denote the solution of this equation by $\bar\rho = \bar\rho_{\alpha,\beta}$.

The dynamical rate function. To state the main result of this article we need to introduce the rate functions of the dynamical and the static large deviations principle of the empirical measure. We start with the dynamical one.

For $T > 0$ and positive integers m, n, we denote by $C^{m,n}([0,T] \times [0,1])$ the space of functions $G\colon [0,T]\times[0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ with m derivatives in time, n derivatives in space which are continuous up to the boundary. We improperly denote by $C^{m,n}_0([0,T]\times[0,1])$ the subset of $C^{m,n}([0,T]\times[0,1])$ of the functions which vanish at the endpoints of $[0,1]$, i.e. $G \in C^{m,n}([0,T]\times[0,1])$ belongs to $C^{m,n}_0([0,T]\times[0,1])$ if and only if $G(t,0) = G(t,1) = 0$, $t \in [0,T]$.

Let the energy $\mathcal{Q} : D([0,T], \mathcal{M}) \to [0,\infty]$ be given by

$$\mathcal{Q}(u) \;=\; \sup_G \Big\{ \int_0^T dt \int_0^1 d\mathbf{x}\, u(t,\mathbf{x})\, (\nabla G)(t,\mathbf{x}) \;-\; \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T dt \int_0^1 d\mathbf{x}\, G(t,\mathbf{x})^2\, \chi(u(t,\mathbf{x})) \Big\} \,,$$

where $\chi : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is the mobility of the system, $\chi(a) = a(1-a)$, and where the supremum is carried over all smooth functions $G : [0,T] \times (0,1) \to \mathbb{R}$ with compact support. It has been shown in [10] that the energy $\mathcal{Q}$ is convex and lower semicontinuous. Moreover, if $\mathcal{Q}(u)$ is finite, u has a generalized space derivative, ∇u, and

$$\mathcal{Q}(u) \;=\; \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T dt \int_0^1 d\mathbf{x}\, \frac{(\nabla u(t))^2}{\chi(u(t))} \,\cdot$$

Fix a function $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ which corresponds to the initial profile. For each H in $C_0^{1,2}([0,T]\times[0,1])$, let $\hat{J}_H(.|\gamma) = \hat{J}_{T,H,\gamma}\colon D([0,T],\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the functional given by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{J}_H(u|\gamma) \quad &:= \quad \langle u_T, H_T\rangle - \langle \gamma, H_0\rangle - \int_0^T dt\, \langle u_t, \partial_t H_t\rangle \;-\; \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T dt\, \langle u_t, \Delta H_t\rangle \quad (2.2)\\ &+ \quad \frac{\beta}{2}\int_0^T dt\, \nabla H_t(1) \;-\; \frac{\alpha}{2}\int_0^T dt\, \nabla H_t(0) \;-\; \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T dt\, \big\langle \chi(u_t), \big(\nabla H_t\big)^2\big\rangle\,.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\hat{I}_{[0,T]}(\,\cdot\,|\gamma)\colon D([0,T],\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow [0,+\infty]$ be the functional defined by

$$\hat{I}_{[0,T]}(u|\gamma) \;:=\; \sup_{H\in C_0^{1,2}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \hat{J}_H(u|\gamma)\,.$$

The dynamical rate functional $I_{[0,T]}(\cdot|\gamma) : D([0,T],\mathcal{M}) \to [0,\infty]$ is given by

$$I_{[0,T]}(u|\gamma) \;=\; \begin{cases} \hat{I}_{[0,T]}(u|\gamma) & \text{if } \mathcal{Q}(u) < \infty\;\;, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

The static rate functional. Denote by $V : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ the quasi-potential associated to the dynamical rate functions $I_{[0,T]}$:

$$V(\gamma) \;=\; \inf_{T>0} \inf \big\{ I_{[-T,0]}(u|\bar{\rho}) : u(-T) = \bar{\rho}\,,\, u(0) = \gamma\,\big\}\,. \tag{2.4}$$

It has been proved in [9, Theorems 2.2, 4.5 and A.1] that V is bounded, convex and lower-semicontinuous, and that $V(\rho) > 0$ for all $\rho \neq \bar{\rho}$. We are now in a position to state the main result of this article.

Theorem 2.1. *Fix an open subset $\mathcal{O}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ such that $d(\bar{\rho},\mathcal{O}) > 0$ and let $H_{\mathcal{O}}$ be the hitting time of the set $\mathcal{O}$, $H_{\mathcal{O}} = \inf\{t : \pi^N(\eta(t)) \in \mathcal{O}\}$. Then, under $\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}$, $H_{\mathcal{O}}/E_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}[H_{\mathcal{O}}]$ converges in distribution to a mean one exponential time. Moreover, if*

$$\inf_{\gamma\in\mathcal{O}} V(\gamma) \;=\; \inf_{\gamma\in\overline{\mathcal{O}}} V(\gamma)\,,$$

where $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ represents the closure of $\mathcal{O}$, we have that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{E}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}[H_{\mathcal{O}}] \;=\; \inf_{\gamma\in\mathcal{O}} V(\gamma)\,.$$

Finally, consider a subset $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ such that

$$\inf_{\gamma\in\mathcal{B}^o} V(\gamma) \;<\; \inf_{\gamma\in\overline{\mathcal{O}}} V(\gamma) \tag{2.5}$$

where $\mathcal{B}^o$ stands for the interior of $\mathcal{B}$. Let $B_N = (\pi^N)^{-1}(\mathcal{B}) = \{\eta \in \Omega_N : \pi^N(\eta) \in \mathcal{B}\}$ and let μ_N be the probability measure on Ω_N defined by $\mu_N(\eta) = \mathbf{1}\{\eta \in B_N\}\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}(\eta)/\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}(B_N)$. Then, under μ_N, $H_{\mathcal{O}}/E_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}[H_{\mathcal{O}}]$ converges in distribution to a mean one exponential time.

This result holds in all dimensions, we restricted ourselves to dimension one for sake of simplicity.

3. Hitting times of rare events have exponential distributions

Consider a sequence of irreducible, continuous-time Markov processes $\{\eta^N(t) : t \ge 0\}$, $N \ge 1$, taking values on a finite state space Ω_N. The points of Ω_N are represented by the Greek letters η, ξ. Denote by ν_N the unique stationary state, by L_N the generator of the process, by $\lambda_N(\eta)$, $\eta \in \Omega_N$, the holding rates, by $p_N(\eta, \xi)$, $\xi \neq \eta \in \Omega_N$, the jump probabilities, and by $R_N(\eta, \xi) = \lambda_N(\eta)\, p_N(\eta, \xi)$ the jump rates. In particular, for every function $f : \Omega_N \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$(L_N f)(\eta) \;=\; \sum_{\xi \in \Omega_N} R_N(\eta, \xi)\, [f(\xi) - f(\eta)]\;,$$

We often omit the superscript N of $\eta^N(t)$.

For a subset A of Ω_N, denote by H_A (resp. H^+_A) the hitting (resp. return) time of a set A:

$$\begin{aligned} H_A \;&:=\; \inf\big\{ s > 0 : \eta(s) \in A \big\}\;, \\ H^+_A \;&:=\; \inf\{ t > 0 : \eta(t) \in A, \eta(s) \neq \eta(0) \ \text{ for some } 0 < s < t\}\;. \end{aligned}$$

When the set A is a singleton $\{\eta\}$, we denote $H_{\{\eta\}}$, $H^+_{\{\eta\}}$ by H_η, H^+_η, respectively.

Let $D(\mathbb{R}_+, \Omega_N)$ be the space of Ω_N-valued, right continuous paths with left limits endowed with the Skorohod topology. Denote by $\mathbb{P}_\eta = \mathbb{P}^N_\eta$, $\eta \in \Omega_N$, the probability measure on $D(\mathbb{R}_+, \Omega_N)$ induced by the Markov process $\eta(t)$ starting from η. Expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}_\eta$ is represented by $\mathbb{E}_\eta$. For a probability measure μ in Ω_N, $\mathbb{P}_\mu[\,\cdot\,] = \sum_{\eta \in \Omega_N} \mu(\eta)\, \mathbb{P}_\eta[\,\cdot\,]$, with the same notation for expectations.

Let $P_t(\eta, \xi)$, $t \ge 0$, η, $\xi \in \Omega_N$, be the semigroup associated to $\eta(t)$, $P_t(\eta, \xi) = \mathbb{P}_\eta[\eta(t) = \xi]$. Denote by $\|\mu - \nu\|_{\rm TV}$ the total variation distance between two probability measures μ and ν defined on Ω_N. Let $T^{\rm mix}_N$ be the mixing time of the process $\eta(t)$:

$$T^{\rm mix}_N \;=\; \inf\Big\{ t > 0 : \max_{\eta \in \Omega_N} \|P_t(\eta, \,\cdot\,) - \nu_N\|_{\rm TV} \le \frac{1}{4} \Big\}\;.$$

Let A_N be a sequence of subsets of Ω_N such that

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \nu_N(A_N) \;=\; 0\;. \tag{3.1}$$

Denote by $H_N = H_{A_N}$ the hitting time of A_N:

$$H_N \;=\; \inf\{ t > 0 : \eta^N(t) \in A_N\}\;,$$

and by $r_N(A^c_N, A_N)$ the average rate at which the process jumps from A^c_N to A_N:

$$r_N(A^c_N, A_N) \;=\; \frac{1}{\nu_N(A^c_N)} \sum_{\xi \in A^c_N} \nu_N(\xi)\, R_N(\xi, A_N)\;,$$

where $R_N(\xi, A_N) = \sum_{\zeta \in A_N} R_N(\xi, \zeta)$.

Nest statement is the main result of this section. It has to be compared with [1, Theorem 1.4]. Instead of requiring that the mixing time is small compared to the the stationary expectation of the hitting time, we assume that the mixing time is small compared to the inverse of the averaged jump rate, $r_N(A^c_N, A_N)^{-1}$, a quantity easily estimated. Moreover, by [11, Lemma 2.3], for reversible dynamics, $r_N(A^c_N, A_N)^{-1}$ is bounded by the expected value of the hitting time of A_N starting from the quasi-stationary state.

Theorem 3.1. *Let A_N be a sequence of subsets of Ω_N satisfying* (3.1). *Assume that $T^{\rm mix}_N \ll r_N(A^c_N, A_N)^{-1}$. Then, under ν_N, the sequence $H_N/\mathbb{E}_{\nu_N}[H_N]$ converges in distribution to a mean one exponential random variable.*

Theorem 3.1 follows from Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5. We prove below in (3.6) and Lemma 3.5 that

$$\liminf_N r_N(A^c_N, A_N)\, \mathbb{E}_{\nu_N}[H_N] \;>\; 0\;.$$

In fact, under some assumptions this product converges to 1. To state this hypotheses we need to introduce some notation.

For two disjoint subsets A, B of the state space Ω_N, denote by $\text{cap}(A,B)$ the capacity between A and B:

$$\text{cap}(A,B) \;=\; \sum_{\eta\in A} \nu_N(\eta)\, \lambda_N(\eta)\, \mathbb{P}_\eta\big[H_B < H^+_A\big]\;.$$

When the set A is a singleton, $A = \{\eta\}$, we write $\text{cap}(\eta, B)$ for $\text{cap}(\{\eta\}, B)$.

Denote by $\{\eta^*(t) : t \ge 0\}$ the stationary Markov process $\eta(t)$ reversed in time. We shall refer to $\eta^*(t)$ as the adjoint or the time reversed process. It is well known that $\eta^*(t)$ is a Markov process on Ω_N whose generator L^*_N is the adjoint of L_N in $L^2(\nu_N)$. The jump rates $R^*_N(\eta,\xi)$, $\eta\neq\xi\in\Omega_N$, of the adjoint process satisfy the balanced equations

$$\nu_N(\eta)\, R_N(\eta,\xi) \;=\; \nu_N(\xi)\, R^*_N(\xi,\eta)\;.$$

Denote by $\lambda^*(\eta) = \lambda(\eta)$, $\eta\in\Omega_N$, $p^*(\eta,\xi)$, $\eta\neq\xi\in\Omega_N$, the holding rates and the jump probabilities of the time reversed process $\eta^*(t)$.

As above, for each $\eta\in\Omega_N$, denote by $\mathbb{P}^*_\eta$ the probability measure on the path space $D(\mathbb{R}_+, \Omega_N)$ induced by the Markov process $\eta^*(t)$ starting from η. Expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}^*_\eta$ is denoted by $\mathbb{E}^*_\eta$.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that there exists a sequence of subsets B_N, $B_N\subset A^c_N$, $\lim_{N\to\infty}\nu_N(B_N) = 1$, such that*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \sup_{\substack{\eta\in B_N\\ \xi\not\in A_N}} \mathbb{P}^*_\xi[H_{A_N} < H_\eta] \;=\; 0\;, \qquad \lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{\eta\not\in A_N\cup B_N} \frac{\nu_N(\eta)}{\text{cap}(\eta, A_N)} \;=\; 0\;. \tag{3.2}$$

Assume, furthermore, that

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} r_N(A^c_N, A_N) \;<\; \infty\;. \tag{3.3}$$

Then,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} r_N(A^c_N, A_N)\, \mathbb{E}_{\nu_N}[H_N] \;=\; 1\;.$$

Proof. Fix $\eta\not\in A_N$. By definition of the capacity, by equation (2.4) and Lemma 2.3 in [24], and by the Markov property,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{cap}(\eta, A_N) \;&=\; \text{cap}^*(\eta, A_N) \;=\; \sum_{\substack{\xi\in A_N\\ \zeta\not\in A_N}} \nu_N(\xi)\, R^*_N(\xi,\zeta)\, \mathbb{P}^*_\zeta[H_\eta < H_{A_N}]\\ &=\; \sum_{\substack{\xi\in A_N\\ \zeta\not\in A_N}} \nu_N(\zeta)\, R_N(\zeta,\xi)\, \mathbb{P}^*_\zeta[H_\eta < H_{A_N}]\;.\end{aligned}$$

This sum is bounded above by $\nu_N(A^c_N) r_N(A^c_N, A_N) \le r_N(A^c_N, A_N)$. On the other hand, if η belongs to B_N, by assumption (3.2), the sum is bounded below by

$(1-\epsilon_N)\nu_N(A_N^{\rm c})r_N(A_N^{\rm c},A_N) \ge (1-\epsilon_N)r_N(A_N^{\rm c},A_N)$, where ϵ_N is a sequence which vanishes as $N\uparrow\infty$, and which may change from line to line.

By [7, Proposition A.2],

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_N}[H_N] \;=\; \sum_{\eta\not\in A_N} \nu_N(\eta)\,\mathbb{E}_\eta[H_N] \;=\; \sum_{\eta\not\in A_N} \nu_N(\eta)\, \frac{\sum_{\xi\not\in A_N} \nu_N(\xi)\,\mathbb{P}^*_\xi[H_\eta < H_{A_N}]}{\text{cap}(\eta, A_N)}\;.$$

By the lower bound for the capacity obtained in the beginning of the proof and by (3.2), this expression is bounded above by

$$\sum_{\eta\in B_N} \frac{\nu_N(\eta)}{\text{cap}(\eta,A_N)} \;+\; \sum_{\eta\not\in A_N\cup B_N} \frac{\nu_N(\eta)}{\text{cap}(\eta,A_N)} \;\le\; (1+\epsilon_N)\, r_N(A_N^{\rm c},A_N)^{-1} \;+\; \epsilon_N\;.$$

In view of (3.3), this proves that

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} r_N(A_N^{\rm c},A_N)\,\mathbb{E}_{\nu_N}[H_N] \;\le\; 1\;.$$

By (3.2) and by the upper bound for the capacity obtained in the beginning of the proof, $\mathbb{E}_{\nu_N}[H_N]$ is bounded below by

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\eta\in B_N} \nu_N(\eta) \frac{\sum_{\xi\not\in A_N} \nu_N(\xi)\,\mathbb{P}^*_\xi[H_\eta < H_{A_N}]}{\text{cap}(\eta,A_N)} \\ &\qquad \ge\; (1-\epsilon_N) \sum_{\eta\in B_N} \frac{\nu_N(\eta)}{\text{cap}(\eta,A_N)} \;\ge\; (1-\epsilon_N)\, r_N(A_N^{\rm c},A_N)^{-1}\;. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the lemma. □

Denote by N_t, $t\ge 0$, the number of jumps from $A_N^{\rm c}$ to A_N in the time interval $[0,t]$. N_t is a Poisson process and M_t, defined by

$$M_t \;=\; N_t \;-\; \int_0^t R_N(\eta(s),A_N)\,\mathbf{1}\{\eta(s)\not\in A_N\}\,ds\;,$$

is a martingale. In particular,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_N}[N_t] \;=\; t\,\nu_N(A_N^{\rm c})\,r_N(A_N^{\rm c},A_N)\;.$$

Note that $\{H_N\le t\} = \{\eta(0)\in A_N\}\cup\{N_t\ge 1\}$. Define

$$X_t \;=\; \mathbf{1}\{\eta(0)\in A_N\} \;+\; N_t$$

so that $\{H_N\le t\} = \{X_t\ge 1\}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}[H_N\le t] \;&=\; \mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}[X_t\ge 1] \;\le\; \mathbb{E}_{\nu_N}[X_t] \\ &\le\; \nu_N(A_N) \;+\; t\,\nu_N(A_N^{\rm c})\,r_N(A_N^{\rm c},A_N)\;. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Lemma 3.3. *Assume that $T_N^{\rm mix}\ll r_N(A_N^{\rm c},A_N)^{-1}$. Let γ_N, σ_N be two sequences such that $T_N^{\rm mix}\ll\sigma_N\ll\min\{\gamma_N, r_N(A_N^{\rm c},A_N)^{-1}\}$. Then, for every t, $s>0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big|\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[H_N > (t+s)\gamma_N\big] \;-\; \mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[H_N > s\gamma_N\big]\,\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[H_N > t\gamma_N\big]\Big| \\ &\qquad \le\; 2\,\nu_N(A_N) \;+\; 2\,\sigma_N\, r_N(A_N^{\rm c},A_N) \;+\; (1/2)^{\sigma_N/T_N^{\rm mix}}\;. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. In view of the definition of X_t, we have to estimate the difference

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[X_{(t+s)\gamma_N}=0\big]\;-\;\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[X_{s\gamma_N}=0\big]\,\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[X_{t\gamma_N}=0\big]\;.$$

Let σ_N be a sequence such that $T^{\rm mix}_N\ll\sigma_N\ll r_N(A^c_N,A_N)^{-1}$. Clearly,

$$\Big|\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[X_{s\gamma_N}=0\big]\;-\;\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[X_{s\gamma_N}-X_{\sigma_N}=0\big]\Big|\;\le\;\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[X_{\sigma_N}\ge 1\big]\;,$$

and, by (3.4), this last probability is bounded by $\nu_N(A_N)\,+\,\sigma_N\,r_N(A^c_N,A_N)$. By stationarity, a similar bound holds for the absolute value of the difference

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[X_{(t+s)\gamma_N}=0\big]\;-\;\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[X_{t\gamma_N}=0\,,\,X_{(t+s)\gamma_N}-X_{t\gamma_N+\sigma_N}=0\big]\;.$$

It remains to estimate the absolute value of the difference

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[X_{t\gamma_N}=0\,,\,X_{(t+s)\gamma_N}-X_{t\gamma_N+\sigma_N}=0\big]\\&\qquad\qquad-\;\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[X_{s\gamma_N}-X_{\sigma_N}=0\big]\,\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[X_{t\gamma_N}=0\big]\;.\end{aligned}$$

By the Markov property, this expression is equal to

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_N}\Big[\mathbf{1}\{X_{t\gamma_N}=0\}\,\Big\{\mathbb{P}_{\eta(t\gamma_N)}\big[X_{s\gamma_N}-X_{\sigma_N}=0\big]\;-\;\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[X_{s\gamma_N}-X_{\sigma_N}=0\big]\Big\}\Big]\;.$$

This expectation is absolutely bounded by

$$\sup_{\eta\in\Omega_N}\Big|\mathbb{E}_\eta\Big[\mathbb{P}_{\eta(\sigma_N)}\big[X_{s\gamma_N-\sigma_N}=0\big]\Big]\;-\;\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[X_{s\gamma_N-\sigma_N}=0\big]\Big|\;\le\;(1/2)^{\sigma_N/T^{\rm mix}_N}\;.$$

where we used the definition of the mixing time in the last inequality. This concludes the proof of the lemma. □

Let θ_N be given by

$$\theta_N\;=\;\inf\Big\{t>0\,:\,\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[H_N>t\big]\;<\;e^{-1}\Big\}\;. \tag{3.5}$$

Note that $\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[H_N>\theta_N\big]\;\le\;e^{-1}$. Hence, by (3.4),

$$1\,-\,e^{-1}\;\le\;\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[H_N\le\theta_N\big]\;\le\;\nu_N(A_N)\;+\;\theta_N\,\nu_N(A^c_N)\,r_N(A^c_N,A_N)\;.$$

Since $\nu_N(A_N)$ vanishes, we deduce from this inequality that

$$\liminf_N\theta_N\,r_N(A^c_N,A_N)\;>\;0\;. \tag{3.6}$$

In particular, $\theta_N\gg T^{\rm mix}_N$.

Lemma 3.4. *Assume that* $T^{\rm mix}_N\ll r_N(A^c_N,A_N)^{-1}$. *Let* θ_N *be the sequence defined by* (3.5). *Under* ν_N, *the sequence of random variables* H_N/θ_N *converges in distribution to a mean one exponential random variable.*

Proof. Since $T^{\rm mix}_N\ll r_N(A^c_N,A_N)^{-1}$, by (3.6), $T^{\rm mix}_N\ll\theta_N$. By Lemma 3.3 with $\gamma_N=\theta_N$ and some sequence σ_N, $T^{\rm mix}_N\ll\sigma_N\ll r_N(A^c_N,A_N)^{-1}$, we have that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\Big[\frac{H_N}{\theta_N}>t\Big]\;=\;e^{-t}\;,\quad t>0\;.$$

□

Lemma 3.5. *The sequence* θ_N *introduced in* (3.5) *satisfies*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\nu_N}[\,H_N\,]}{\theta_N}\;=\;1\;.$$

Proof. Let

$$\theta_N(\eta) \;:=\; \inf\big\{t>0\,:\, \mathbb{P}_\eta[\,H_N>t\,]\;\le\; e^{-1}\big\}\;, \quad \eta\in\Omega_N\;,$$

and let $\hat\theta_N = \max_{\eta\in\Omega_N}\theta_N(\eta)$. We first claim that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\theta_N/\hat\theta_N \;=\; 1\;. \tag{3.7}$$

It is clear that $\theta_N\le\hat\theta_N$. Indeed, if $t>\hat\theta_N$, $t>\theta_N(\eta)$ for all $\eta\in\Omega_N$, so that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}[\,H_N>t\,] \;=\; \sum_{\eta\in\Omega_N}\nu_N(\eta)\,\mathbb{P}_\eta[\,H_N>t\,]\;\le\; e^{-1}\;.$$

Hence, $\theta_N\le t$ and $\theta_N\le\hat\theta_N$.

To prove the converse inequality, let $\theta_N(a)$, $a>0$, be given by

$$\theta_N(a)\;:=\;\inf\big\{t>0\,:\,\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}[\,H_N>t\,]\;\le\; e^{-a}\big\}\;.$$

For any $\eta\in\Omega_N$, $\epsilon>0$, $L\ge 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}_\eta\big[\,H_N>\theta_N(1+\epsilon)+LT_N^{\rm mix}\,\big]\;\le\;\mathbb{E}_\eta\Big[\,\mathbb{P}_{\eta(LT_N^{\rm mix})}\big[\,H_N>\theta_N(1+\epsilon)\,\big]\,\Big]$$

By definition of the mixing time and of $\theta_N(1+\epsilon)$, the last expectation is bounded by

$$2^{-L}\;+\;\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[\,H_N>\theta_N(1+\epsilon)\,\big]\;\le\;2^{-L}\;+\;e^{-(1+\epsilon)}\;\le\;e^{-1}$$

provided $2^{-L}\le e^{-1}[1-e^{-\epsilon}]$. Hence, $\theta_N(\eta)\le\theta_N(1+\epsilon)+LT_N^{\rm mix}$ for all $\eta\in\Omega_N$ so that $\hat\theta_N\le\theta_N(1+\epsilon)+LT_N^{\rm mix}$.

Denote by R_N the right hand side of the inequality appearing in the statement of Lemma 3.3 with γ_N replaced by θ_N. Iterating $k-1$ times this estimate, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[\,H_N>\theta_N/k\,\big]\;\le\;\Big(\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[\,H_N>\theta_N\,\big]+k\,R_N\Big)^{1/k}\;.$$

Applying once more Lemma 3.3, we get that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[\,H_N>(k+1)\theta_N/k\,\big]\;\le\;\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[\,H_N>\theta_N\,\big]\,\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[\,H_N>\theta_N/k\,\big]+R_N\;,$$

so that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}\big[\,H_N>(k+1)\theta_N/k\,\big]\;\le\;e^{-1}\big(e^{-1}+k\,R_N\big)^{1/k}\;+\;R_N\;.$$

Since R_N vanishes, if $k>\epsilon^{-1}$ this expression is bounded by $e^{-(1+\epsilon)}$ for N sufficiently large. Therefore, $\theta_N(1+\epsilon)\le(1+k^{-1})\theta_N$ for all N large enough if $k>\epsilon^{-1}$. Taking $k=[\epsilon^{-1}]+1$, where $[a]$ stands for the integer part of a, we conclude from the previous two estimates that for N large enough

$$\hat\theta_N\;\le\;\Big(1+\frac{1}{[\epsilon^{-1}]+1}\Big)\,\theta_N\;+\;L\,T_N^{\rm mix}$$

provided $2^{-L}\le e^{-1}[1-e^{-\epsilon}]$. This proves that for every $\epsilon>0$, $\limsup_N(\hat\theta_N/\theta_N)\le 1+([\epsilon^{-1}]+1)^{-1}$, i.e., that $\limsup_N(\hat\theta_N/\theta_N)\le 1$, proving claim (3.7).

It follows from Lemma 3.4 and (3.7) that $H_N/\hat\theta_N$ converges in distribution to a mean one exponential random variable. We claim that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\nu_N}[\,H_N\,]}{\hat\theta_N}\;=\;1\;. \tag{3.8}$$

To prove (3.8), we change variables to obtain that

$$\hat\theta_N^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{\nu_N}[\,H_N\,] \;=\; \hat\theta_N^{-1}\int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}[\,H_N > t\,]\,dt \;=\; \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}[\,H_N/\hat\theta_N > t\,]\,dt\,.$$

It remains to obtain a bound to apply the dominated convergence theorem. By definition of $\hat\theta_N$, $\mathbb{P}_\eta[\,H_N > \hat\theta_N\,] \le e^{-1}$ for all $\eta\in\Omega_N$. By the Markov property, we obtain that $\mathbb{P}_\eta[\,H_N > t\hat\theta_N\,] \le \mathbb{P}_\eta[\,H_N > [t]\hat\theta_N\,] \le e^{-[t]}$ so that $\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}[\,H_N/\hat\theta_N > t\,] \le e^{-[t]}$. □

Corollary 3.6. *Assume that the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1 are fulfilled. Let $\{\mu_N : N\ge 1\}$ be a sequence of probability measures and suppose that there exists a sequence S_N, $T_N^{\rm mix} \ll S_N \ll \mathbb{E}_{\nu_N}[H_N]$, such that*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}[\,H_N < S_N\,] \;=\; 0\,. \tag{3.9}$$

Then, under μ_N, $H_N/\mathbb{E}_{\nu_N}[H_N]$ converges in distribution to a mean one exponential random variable.

Proof. Let $\mathbb{U}_N = \mathbb{E}_{\nu_N}[H_N]$ and fix $t>0$. Clearly,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}[\,H_N \le t\,\mathbb{U}_N\,] \;=\; \mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}[\,S_N \le H_N \le t\,\mathbb{U}_N\,] \;+\; \mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}[\,S_N > H_N\,,\, H_N \le t\,\mathbb{U}_N\,]\,.$$

By assumption, the second term on the right hand side vanishes as $N\uparrow\infty$, while the first one, by the Markov property, is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\mu_N}\big[\,\mathbf{1}\{S_N \le H_N\}\,\mathbb{P}_{\eta(S_N)}[\,H_N \le t\,\mathbb{U}_N - S_N\,]\,\big] \\
&\quad =\; \mathbb{E}_{\mu_N}\big[\,\mathbb{P}_{\eta(S_N)}[\,H_N \le t\,\mathbb{U}_N - S_N\,]\,\big] \\
&\qquad -\; \mathbb{E}_{\mu_N}\big[\,\mathbf{1}\{S_N > H_N\}\,\mathbb{P}_{\eta(S_N)}[\,H_N \le t\,\mathbb{U}_N - S_N\,]\,\big]\,.
\end{aligned}$$

As before, the second term on right hand side vanishes as $N\uparrow\infty$. The first one, since $T_N^{\rm mix} \ll S_N$ is equal to

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu_N}[\,H_N \le t\,\mathbb{U}_N - S_N\,] \;+\; R_N\,,$$

where $\lim_N R_N = 0$. Since $S_N \ll \mathbb{U}_N$, by Theorem 3.1, the first term in the previous displayed formula converges to $1-e^{-t}$, which proves the corollary. □

To apply the previous corollary one needs among other things to estimate $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}[\,H_N < S_N\,]$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\nu_N}[H_N]$. In the next section we present a general method to estimate the latter sequence when a dynamical large deviations principle is available. There are several ways to bound $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}[\,H_N < S_N\,]$. We present below three approaches. The first two uses the enlarged processes introduced by Bianchi and Gaudillière [11], the second and the third ones are taken from the martingale approach to metastability [8].

Consider a sequence γ_N of positive real numbers. Let $\Omega_N^\star$ be a copy of the set Ω_N and recall from [8, Section 2.C] the definition of the enlarged process associated to the sequence γ_N, a Markov process, denoted by $\eta^\star(t)$, on $\Omega_N\cup\Omega_N^\star$ which jumps from a state $\eta\in\Omega_N$ to its copy $\eta^\star\in\Omega_N^\star$ at rate γ_N. Denote by $\nu_N^\star$ the stationary measure of the enlarged process and recall that $\nu_N^\star(\eta) = \nu_N^\star(\eta^\star) = (1/2)\nu_N(\eta)$. Let $\mathrm{cap}_\star$ be the capacity with respect to the enlarged process, and for a subset B of Ω_N, denote by $B^\star$ the copy of the set B. Next result is Corollary 4.2 in [8].

Lemma 3.7. *Let μ_N be a sequence of probability measures concentrated on A_N^c and set $\gamma_N = S_N^{-1}$. Assume that*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} S_N \, E_{\nu_N} \Big[\Big(\frac{d\mu_N}{d\nu_N} \Big)^2 \Big] \operatorname{cap}_\star(A_N, (A_N^c)^\star) \;=\; 0 \;.$$

Then, (3.9) *holds.*

Theorems 2.4 and 2.7 in [24] provide variational formulae for the capacity. The second theorem expresses the capacity as an infimum over flows. It permits, in particular, to obtain simple upper bounds. An elementary bound for the capacity is obtained as follows. By definition of the capacity and since $\nu^\star(\eta) = (1/2)\nu(\eta)$,

$$\operatorname{cap}_\star(A_N, (A_N^c)^\star) \;=\; (1/2) \sum_{\eta\in A_N} \nu(\eta) \big\{ R_N(\eta, \Omega_N) + \gamma_N \big\} \, \mathbb{P}^\star_\eta \big[H_{(A_N^c)^\star} < H^+_{A_N} \big] \;,$$

where $\mathbb{P}^\star_\eta$ represent the distribution of the enlarged process $\eta^\star(t)$ starting from η. Therefore, (3.9) holds if

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} S_N \, E_{\nu_N} \Big[\Big(\frac{d\mu_N}{d\nu_N} \Big)^2 \Big] \big\{ S_N^{-1} + \max_{\eta\in A_N} R_N(\eta, \Omega_N) \big\} \, \nu_N(A_N) \;=\; 0 \;. \tag{3.10}$$

Lemma 3.8. *Let μ_N be a sequence of probability measures on Ω_N and let $R'(\eta, A_N) = \mathbf{1}\{\eta\in A_N^c\} \, R_N(\eta, A_N)$. Assume that*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \Big\{ \mu_N(A_N) \;+\; E_{\nu_N} \big[R'_N(\eta, A_N) \big] \sum_{\eta\in\Omega_N} \mu_N(\eta) \, \frac{1}{\operatorname{cap}_\star(\eta, \Omega_N^\star)} \Big\} \;=\; 0$$

for some sequence $\gamma_N^{-1} \gg S_N$. Then, (3.9) *holds.*

In the reversible case, the Thomson principle permits to estimate from below the capacity. If $\gamma_N^{-1} \gg T_N^{\rm mix}$, starting from any state in Ω_N, the distribution of $\eta^\star(H_{\Omega_N^\star})$ is close to the stationary state ν_N lifted to $\Omega_N^\star$. Since the capacity can be interpreted as the inverse of a distance, the sum on the right hand side measures the distance from μ_N to the stationary state ν_N.

Proof of Lemma 3.8. We first replace the deterministic sequence S_N in (3.9) by a sequence of exponential random variables independent of the Markov process $\eta(t)$. Denote by $\mathfrak{e}_N$ a mean γ_N^{-1} exponential time independent of the Markov process $\eta(t)$. Since $S_N \ll \gamma_N^{-1}$,

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_N} [\, H_N < S_N \,] \;\le\; \liminf_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_N} [\, H_N < \mathfrak{e}_N \,] \;. \tag{3.11}$$

Repeating the steps which led to (3.4), we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mu_N} [\, H_N < \mathfrak{e}_N \,] \;\le\; \mu_N(A_N) \;+\; \mathbb{E}_{\mu_N} \Big[\int_0^{\mathfrak{e}_N} R'_N(\eta(s), A_N) \, ds \Big] \;.$$

In this step we used twice the monotone convergence theorem and we replaced $\mathfrak{e}_N$ by $\mathfrak{e}_N \wedge t$ to overcome the unboundedness of $\mathfrak{e}_N$.

Clearly, starting from any configuration in Ω_N, we may interpret $\mathfrak{e}_N$ as the hitting time of $\Omega_N^\star$ for the enlarged process so that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_N} \Big[\int_0^{\mathfrak{e}_N} R'_N(\eta(s), A_N) \, ds \Big] \;=\; \mathbb{E}^\star_{\mu_N} \Big[\int_0^{H_{\Omega_N^\star}} R'_N(\eta^\star(s), A_N) \, ds \Big] \;.$$

By [7, Proposition A.2], since the equilibrium potential is bounded by 1 and since $\nu^\star_N(\eta) = (1/2)\nu_N(\eta)$, $\eta\in\Omega_N$, the previous expectation is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\eta\in\Omega_N}\mu_N(\eta)\,\mathbb{E}^\star_\eta\Big[\int_0^{H_{\Omega^\star_N}} R'_N(\eta^\star(s),A_N)\,ds\Big]\\&\qquad\le\; E_{\nu_N}\big[R'_N(\eta,A_N)\big]\sum_{\eta\in\Omega_N}\mu_N(\eta)\,\frac{1}{2\,\mathrm{cap}_\star(\eta,\Omega^\star_N)}\;,\end{aligned}$$

which proves the lemma. □

We conclude this section with a third set of sufficient conditions for (3.9). Denote by $T^{\rm rel}_N$ the relaxation time, i.e. the inverse of the spectral gap of the symmetric part of the generator, and denote by $\|\cdot\|_p$ the norm of $L^p(\nu_N)$, $0<p\le\infty$.

Lemma 3.9. *Let S_N be an increasing sequence and let μ_N be a sequence of probability measures on Ω_N. Assume that*

$$\begin{gathered}\lim_{N\to\infty}\Big\{\mu_N(A_N)\;+\;S_N\,\nu_N(A^c_N)\,r_N(A^c_N,A_N)\Big\}\;=\;0\;,\\ \lim_{N\to\infty}\|R'_N(\cdot\,,A_N)\|_2\,\Big\|\frac{d\mu_N}{d\nu_N}\Big\|_2\,T^{\rm rel}_N\Big(1-e^{-S_N/T^{\rm rel}_N}\Big)\;=\;0\;,\end{gathered}$$

where $R'_N(\eta,A_N)=\mathbf{1}\{\eta\notin A_N\}\,R_N(\eta,A_N)$. Then, (3.9) *holds.*

We may estimate $\|R'_N(\cdot\,,A_N)\|^2_2$ by $\|R'_N(\cdot\,,A_N)\|_\infty\,\|R'_N(\cdot\,,A_N)\|_1$ and recall that $\|R'_N(\cdot\,,A_N)\|_1=\nu_N(A^c_N)\,r_N(A^c_N,A_N)$ which vanishes asymptotically.

Proof of Lemma 3.9. Repeating the steps which led to (3.4), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}[\,H_N<S_N\,]\;&\le\;\mu_N(A_N)\;+\;\mathbb{E}_{\mu_N}\Big[\int_0^{S_N}\mathbf{1}\{\eta(s)\notin A_N\}\,R_N(\eta(s),A_N)\,ds\Big]\\&=\;\mu_N(A_N)\;+\;S_N\,\nu_N(A^c_N)\,r_N(A^c_N,A_N)\;+\;\int_0^{S_N}\mathbb{E}_{\mu_N}\Big[\hat R_N(\eta(s))\Big]\,ds\;,\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat R_N(\eta)$ is the ν_N-mean zero function $\hat R_N(\eta)=R'_N(\eta,A_N)-E_{\nu_N}[R'_N(\eta,A_N)]$, and $E_{\nu_N}[R'_N(\eta,A_N)]=\nu_N(A^c_N)\,r_N(A^c_N,A_N)$.

We estimate the last term of the previous displayed equation. Let $f_s(\eta)$, $\eta\in\Omega_N$, $s\ge0$, be the unique solution of

$$f_0(\eta)\;=\;\frac{\mu_N(\eta)}{\nu_N(\eta)}\;,\quad\frac{d}{ds}f_s=L^*_Nf_s\;,$$

where L^*_N stands for the adjoint of L_N in $L^2(\nu_N)$. With this notation the integral in the penultimate displayed equation becomes

$$\int_0^{S_N}\langle\hat R_N,f_s\rangle_{\nu_N}\,ds\;\le\;\|\hat R_N\|_2\int_0^{S_N}\langle f_s;f_s\rangle^{1/2}_{\nu_N}\,ds\;,$$

where $\langle\cdot\,,\cdot\rangle_{\nu_N}$ represents the scalar product in $L^2(\nu_N)$ and $\langle f_s;f_s\rangle_{\nu_N}$ the variance of f_s. It is well known that $\langle f_s;f_s\rangle_{\nu_N}\le\langle f_0;f_0\rangle_{\nu_N}\,e^{-2s/T^{\rm rel}_N}$. The previous expression is thus bounded by

$$\|\hat R_N\|_2\,\langle f_0;f_0\rangle^{1/2}_{\nu_N}\,T^{\rm rel}_N\Big(1-e^{-S_N/T^{\rm rel}_N}\Big)\;,$$

which proves the lemma by replacing variances by L^2 norms. □

4. Expectations of hitting times

We showed in the previous section that in the context of finite state Markov processes, the hitting time of rare events is asymptotically distributed according to an exponential law. We show in this section that the expectation under the stationary measure of these hitting times can be estimated if one is able to prove a dynamical large deviations principle. Instead of presenting this result in a general setting, we examine the case of the BDSSEP.

The dynamical large deviation principle. We recall a result first proved in [9], and then in [10] in the form presented below. We say that sequence of configurations $\{\eta^N : N \geq 1\}$, $\eta^N \in \Omega_N$, is *associated* to the macroscopic density profile $\rho \in \mathcal{M}$ if the sequence $\pi^N(\eta^N)$ converges to ρ in $\mathcal{M}$ as $N \to \infty$.

Given $T > 0$, we denote by $D\big([0,T];\mathcal{M}\big)$ the Skorohod space of paths from $[0,T]$ to $\mathcal{M}$ equipped with its Borel σ-algebra. Elements of $D\big([0,T],\mathcal{M}\big)$ will be denoted by $u(t)$ and sometimes u_t.

Fix a profile $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ and consider a sequence $\{\eta^N : N \geq 1\}$ associated to γ. It has been proven in [17, 27] following the work of [15, 28] that as $N \to \infty$ the sequence of random variables

$$\pi^N(t) \; := \; \pi^N(\eta^N(tN^2)) \; , \tag{4.1}$$

which take values in $D\big([0,T],\mathcal{M}\big)$, converges in probability to the unique weak solution $u(t)$ of the heat equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = (1/2)\Delta u \; , \\ u(t,0) = \alpha \; , \quad u(t,1) = \beta \; , \quad t \geq 0 \; , \\ u(0,x) = \gamma(x) \; , \quad 0 \leq x \leq 1 \; . \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

Note that time has been speeded-up by N^2 in (4.1).

Recall the definition of the rate functional $I_{[0,T]}(\cdot|\gamma)$ of the dynamical large deviations principle introduced in (2.3). The next two results have been proven in [10].

Lemma 4.1. *Fix $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ and $T > 0$. The functional $I_{[0,T]}(\cdot|\gamma)$ is lower semicontinuous and has compact level sets. Any path u with finite rate function, $I_{[0,T]}(u|\gamma) < \infty$, is continuous in time and satisfies the boundary conditions $u(0,\cdot) = \gamma(\cdot)$, $u(\cdot,0) = \alpha$, $u(\cdot,1) = \beta$. Furthermore, any trajectory u with finite rate function can be approximated by a sequence of smooth trajectories $\{u^n : n \geq 1\}$ in such a way that $I_{[0,T]}(u^n|\gamma)$ converges to $I_{[0,T]}(u|\gamma)$.*

The dynamical large deviation principle can now be stated.

Theorem 4.2. *Fix $T > 0$ and an initial profile γ in $\mathcal{M}$. Consider a sequence $\{\eta^N : N \geq 1\}$ of configurations associated to γ. Then, the sequence of probability measures $\{\mathbb{P}^N_{\eta^N} \circ (\pi^N(N^2\,\cdot\,)^{-1} : N \geq 1\}$ on $D([0,T],\mathcal{M})$ satisfies a large deviation principle with speed N and good rate function $I_{[0,T]}(\cdot|\gamma)$. Namely, $I_{[0,T]}(\cdot|\gamma) : D\big([0,T];\mathcal{M}\big) \to [0,\infty]$ has compact level sets and for each closed set $\mathfrak{C} \subset D([0,T],\mathcal{M})$ and each open set $\mathfrak{O} \subset D([0,T],\mathcal{M})$*

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}^N_{\eta^N}\big(\pi^N(N^2\,\cdot\,) \in \mathfrak{C}\big) \;\leq\; -\inf_{u\in\mathfrak{C}} I_{[0,T]}(u|\gamma)$$

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}^N_{\eta^N}\big(\pi^N(N^2\,\cdot\,) \in \mathfrak{O}\big) \;\geq\; -\inf_{u\in\mathfrak{O}} I_{[0,T]}(u|\gamma) \; .$$

The static large deviation principle. The large deviations principle for the empirical measure under the stationary state $\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}$, stated below, is taken from [12, 18].

Theorem 4.3. *The sequence of probability measures* $\{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}\circ(\pi^N)^{-1} : N\ge 1\}$ *on* $\mathcal{M}$ *satisfies a large deviation principle with speed* N *and good rate function* V. *Namely,* $V:\mathcal{M}\to[0,\infty]$ *has compact level sets and for each closed set* $\mathcal{C}\subset\mathcal{M}$ *and each open set* $\mathcal{O}\subset\mathcal{M}$

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\log\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}\big(\pi^N\in\mathcal{C}\big) \;&\le\; -\inf_{\gamma\in\mathcal{C}} V(\gamma)\\ \liminf_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\log\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}\big(\pi^N\in\mathcal{O}\big) \;&\ge\; -\inf_{\gamma\in\mathcal{O}} V(\gamma)\;.\end{aligned}$$

Expectation of hitting times. The main result of this section can now be stated. Fix an open subset $\mathcal{O}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ and let

$$A_N \;=\; (\pi^N)^{-1}(\mathcal{O}) = \{\eta\in\Omega_N : \pi^N(\eta)\in\mathcal{O}\}\;,$$

and let $H_N = H_{A_N}$ be the hitting time of the set A_N. Note that H_N coincides with the hitting time $H_{\mathcal{O}}$ introduced in Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 4.4. *Fix an open subset* $\mathcal{O}$ *of* $\mathcal{M}$. *Assume that* $T^{\rm mix}_N \ll \exp\{aN\}$ *for all* $a>0$, *that* $H_N/\mathbb{E}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}[H_N]$ *converges in distribution to a mean one exponential random variable, and that*

$$V(\mathcal{O}) \;:=\; \inf_{\gamma\in\mathcal{O}} V(\gamma) \;=\; \inf_{\gamma\in\overline{\mathcal{O}}} V(\gamma)\;.$$

Then, for every $\epsilon>0$,

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty}\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}[H_N]}{e^{N\{V(\mathcal{O})-\epsilon\}}} \;>\; 0\;,\quad \limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}[H_N]}{e^{N[V(\mathcal{O})+\epsilon]}} \;<\; \infty\;.$$

In particular,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\log\mathbb{E}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}[H_N] \;=\; V(\mathcal{O})\;.$$

To prove this result we first need a dynamical large deviations principle starting from the stationary measure.

Theorem 4.5. *For each* $T>0$, *each closed set* $\mathfrak{C}\subset D([0,T],\mathcal{M})$ *and each open set* $\mathfrak{O}\subset D([0,T],\mathcal{M})$,

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\log\mathbb{P}^N_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big(\pi^N(N^2\,\cdot\,)\in\mathfrak{C}\big) \;&\le\; -\inf_{u\in\mathfrak{C}}\big\{I_{[0,T]}(u|u_0)+V(u_0)\big\}\\ \liminf_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\log\mathbb{P}^N_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big(\pi^N(N^2\,\cdot\,)\in\mathfrak{O}\big) \;&\ge\; -\inf_{u\in\mathfrak{O}}\big\{I_{[0,T]}(u|u_0)+V(u_0)\big\}\;.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. In order to simplify the expressions, we will use the fact that concerning the SSEP process, as mentioned in [10, last part of section 2], the two dynamical rate functionals $I_{[0,T]}(u|\gamma)$ and $\hat I_{[0,T]}(u|\gamma)$ (see (2.3)) are the same.

We start with the proof of the upper bound. The arguments closely follow the ones presented in [10]. Theorem 4.3 is used afterwards to estimate the large deviations from the initial stationary distribution.

It is well known that using an exponential tightness argument, it is enough to prove the upper bound for compact sets. For any function $(t,x) \mapsto H_t(x) \in C_0^{1,2}([0,T]\times[0,1])$, we introduce the exponential martingale M_t^H defined by

$$M_t^H \; = \; \exp\Big\{ N\Big[\langle \pi_t^N, H_t\rangle - \langle \pi_0^N, H_0\rangle \\ - \frac{1}{N}\int_0^t e^{-N\langle \pi_s^N, H_s\rangle}(\partial_s + L_N)\, e^{N\langle \pi_s^N, H_s\rangle}\, ds\Big]\Big\}\;.$$

Using a super-exponential estimate ([10, Theorem 3.2]), for any $\delta > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a set of configurations $\eta \in B_{\delta,\epsilon}^{H,N}$ such that for any $\delta > 0$

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\log \mathbb{P}^N_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\Big[\big(B_{\delta,\epsilon}^{H,N}\big)^{\complement}\Big] \; = \; -\infty\;.$$

and on which

$$M_T^H \; = \; \exp N\Big\{ \hat{J}_H(\pi^{N,\epsilon}|\pi_0^N) \; + \; O_H(\epsilon) \; + \; O(\delta)\Big\}\;,$$

where the functional $\hat{J}_H$ was defined in (2.2), $O_H(\epsilon)$ (resp. $O(\delta)$) is an deterministic expression which vanishes as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ (resp. $\delta \downarrow 0$) and where, for any density $\pi \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$\pi^\epsilon(u) = \frac{1}{2\epsilon}\int_{[u-\epsilon,u+\epsilon]\cap[0,1]} \pi(u)\, du.$$

Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a compact subset of $D([0,T],\mathcal{M})$, then

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\log \mathbb{P}^N_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big[\pi^N \in \mathcal{K}\big] \\ \le \limsup_{\delta\downarrow 0}\limsup_{\epsilon\downarrow 0}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\log \mathbb{P}^N_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big[\{\pi^N\in\mathcal{K}\}\cap B_{\delta,\epsilon}^{H,N}\big]$$

and we can write

$$\mathbb{P}^N_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big[\{\pi^N\in\mathcal{K}\}\cap B_{\delta,\epsilon}^{H,N}\big] = \mathbb{E}^N_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big[M_T^H (M_T^H)^{-1}\mathbf{1}_{\{\pi^N\in\mathcal{K}\}\cap B_{\delta,\epsilon}^{H,N}}\big].$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{N}\log \mathbb{P}^N_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big[\{\pi^N\in\mathcal{K}\}\cap B_{\delta,\epsilon}^{H,N}\big] \\ \le \frac{1}{N}\log \mathbb{E}^N_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\Big[M_T^H \exp N\sup_{u\in\mathcal{K}}\big\{-\hat{J}_H(u^\epsilon|\pi_0^N)\big\}\Big] + O_H(\epsilon) + O(\delta)$$

and since M_T^H is a mean 1 martingale, we get

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\log \mathbb{P}^N_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big[\pi^N\in\mathcal{K}\big] \\ \le \limsup_{\epsilon\downarrow 0}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\log E_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\Big[\exp N\sup_{u\in\mathcal{K}}\big\{-\hat{J}_H(u^\epsilon|\pi^N)\big\}\Big].$$

We notice that the map $\pi \mapsto \sup_{u\in\mathcal{K}}\{-\hat{J}_H(u^\epsilon|\pi)\}$ is continuous on $\mathcal{M}$, so we can apply Varadhan's Lemma to the large deviation principle stated in Theorem 4.3

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\log E_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\Big[\exp N\sup_{u\in\mathcal{K}}\big\{-\hat{J}_H(u^\epsilon|\pi^N)\big\}\Big] \\ = \sup_{\gamma\in\mathcal{M}}\big\{\sup_{u\in\mathcal{K}}\{-\hat{J}_H(u^\epsilon|\gamma)\} - V(\gamma)\big\} = -\inf_{\gamma\in\mathcal{M},u\in\mathcal{K}}\{\hat{J}_H(u^\epsilon|\gamma) + V(\gamma)\}.$$

Now, since $\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}$ is compact, we can follow step by step the arguments of [10, section 3.3] and we get

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}^N_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}} \big[\pi^N \in \mathcal{K}\big] \le - \inf_{\gamma\in\mathcal{M}, u\in\mathcal{K}} \{I_{[0,T]}(u,\gamma) + V(\gamma)\},$$

which is precisely the required upper bound since $I_{[0,T]}(u,\gamma) < +\infty$ implies that $u_0 = \gamma$.

The proof of the lower bound is easier. Indeed recalling the definition of the rate function V, we only have to show that for any $u \in D([0,T],\mathcal{M})$, any $S > 0$, any $\pi \in D([-S,0],\mathcal{M})$ such that $\pi_{-S} = \bar\rho$ and $\pi_0 = u_0$, and for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}^N_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}} \big[\pi^N \in B_{[0,T]}(u,\delta)\big] \ge -I_{[-S,0]}(\pi|\bar\rho) - I_{[0,T]}(u|u_0),$$

where $B_{[0,T]}(u,\delta)$ is the ball centered at u with radius δ for the Skorohod topology on $D([0,T],\mathcal{M})$. If we denote by $\tilde u$ the density path given by π on $[-S,0]$ and u on $[0,T]$, then $\tilde u \in D([-S,T],\mathcal{M})$ and $I_{[-S,T]}(\tilde u) = I_{[-S,0]}(\pi|\bar\rho) + I_{[0,T]}(u|u_0)$. Therefore, since $\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}$ is a stationary distribution, we have

$$\mathbb{P}^N_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}} \big[\pi^N \in B_{[0,T]}(u,\delta)\big] \ge \mathbb{P}^N_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}} \big[\pi^N \in B_{[-S,T]}(\tilde u,\delta)\big].$$

As under $\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}$ the initial empirical density π^N_0 converges to the stationary density $\bar\rho$, the lower bound proved in [10] applies here and we get

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}^N_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}} \big[\pi^N \in B_{[-S,T]}(u,\delta)\big] \ge -I_{[-S,T]}(\tilde u|\bar\rho).$$

□

Next lemma is also needed in the proof of Theorem 4.4.

Lemma 4.6. *Fix a subset* $\mathcal{B}$ *of* $\mathcal{M}$ *and* $T > 0$. *Let* $\mathfrak{A} = \{u \in C([0,T],\mathcal{M}) : u(t) \in \mathcal{B}$ *for some* $0 \le t \le T\}$. *Then,*

$$\inf_{u\in\mathfrak{A}} \big\{ I_{[0,T]}(u|u_0) + V(u_0) \big\} \;\ge\; \inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{B}} V(\rho)\ .$$

Proof. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and $u \in \mathfrak{A}$. Assume that $u(t_0) \in \mathcal{B}$, $0 \le t_0 \le T$. By (2.4), there exists $T_0 > 0$ and a path $v \in C([-T_0,0],\mathcal{M})$ such that $v(-T_0) = \bar\rho$, $v(0) = u(0) = u_0$, $I_{[-T_0,0]}(v|\bar\rho) \le V(u_0) + \epsilon$. Defining the path w in $C[-T_0,t_0],\mathcal{M})$ by $w(t) = v(t)$, $-T_0 \le t \le 0$, $w(t) = u(t)$, $0 \le t \le t_0$, we obtain a path connecting $\bar\rho$ to $u(t_0) \in \mathcal{B}$. By (2.4), $I_{[-T_0,t_0]}(w|\bar\rho) \ge \inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{B}} V(\rho)$. It follows from the estimates just obtained that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{[0,T]}(u|u_0) + V(u_0) \;&\ge\; I_{[0,t_0]}(u|u_0) + V(u_0) \\ &=\; I_{[-T_0,t_0]}(w|\bar\rho) + V(u_0) - I_{[-T_0,0]}(v|\bar\rho) \;\ge\; \inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{B}} V(\rho) \;-\; \epsilon\ , \end{aligned}$$

which proves the lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 4.4. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. There exists $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}$ such that

$$V(\gamma) \;<\; \inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{O}} V(\rho) \;+\; (\epsilon/2)\ ,$$

and there exists δ such that $B_\delta(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{O}$. By (2.4) and by translation invariance of the dynamical rate function, there exist $T_\epsilon > 0$ and a path $u^{(\epsilon)}(t)$, $0 \le t \le T_\epsilon$, $u^{(\epsilon)}_0 = \bar\rho$, $u^{(\epsilon)}(T_\epsilon) = \gamma$ such that

$$I_{[0,T_\epsilon]}(u^{(\epsilon)}|\bar\rho) \;<\; \inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{O}} V(\rho) \;+\; \epsilon\ . \tag{4.3}$$

For $\varphi > 0$, $T > 0$ and a path $u \in D([0,T], \mathcal{M})$ denote by $\mathbb{B}_{\varphi,T}(u)$ the open ball in $D([0,T], \mathcal{M})$ of radius φ centered around u. Let $G = \mathbb{B}_{\delta,T_\epsilon}(u^{(\epsilon)})$, $G_L = \{u \in D([0, L\, T_N^{\rm mix}/N^2 + T_\epsilon], \mathcal{M}) : u(L\, T_N^{\rm mix}/N^2 + \,\cdot\,) \in G\}$ It is clear from the definition of G that $G_L \subset \{H_N \le L\, T_N^{\rm mix} + T_\epsilon N^2\}$. Hence, for any configuration $\xi \in \Omega_N$,

$$\mathbb{P}_\xi\big[H_N \le L\, T_N^{\rm mix} + T_\epsilon N^2\big] \;\ge\; \mathbb{P}_\xi\big[\pi^N \in G_L\big] \;=\; \sum_{\zeta\in\Omega_N} P_{L\, T_N^{\rm mix}}(\xi,\zeta)\, \mathbb{P}_\zeta\big[\pi^N \in G\big]\;,$$

where $P_t(\eta,\xi)$, $t > 0$, stands for the transition probability of the BDSSEP. By definition of the mixing time, the previous expression is bounded below by

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big[\pi^N \in G\big] \;-\; 2^{-L}\;.$$

Therefore, for every $L \ge 1$,

$$\inf_{\xi\in\Omega_N} \mathbb{P}_\xi\big[H_N \le L\, T_N^{\rm mix} + T_\epsilon N^2\big] \;\ge\; \mathbb{P}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big[\pi^N \in G\big] \;-\; 2^{-L}\;. \tag{4.4}$$

By Theorem 4.5, by definition of G, by (4.3) and since $u^{(\epsilon)}_0 = \bar\rho$, $V(\bar\rho) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big[\pi^N \in G\big] \;&\ge\; -\inf_{u\in G}\big\{I_{[0,T_\epsilon]}(u|u_0) + V(u_0)\big\} \\ &\ge\; -\big\{I_{[0,T_\epsilon]}(u^{(\epsilon)}|u^{(\epsilon)}_0) + V(u^{(\epsilon)}_0)\big\} \;\ge\; -(V(\mathcal{O}) + \epsilon)\;.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, there exists $N_0 = N_0(\epsilon,\delta)$ such that for all $N \ge N_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big[\pi^N \in G\big] \;\ge\; \exp -N\big\{V(\mathcal{O}) + 2\epsilon\big\}\;.$$

The previous estimate together with (4.4) for $L = \ell\, N$ gives that for all $N \ge N_0$,

$$\max_{\xi\in\Omega_N} \mathbb{P}_\xi\big[H_N > \ell\, N\, T_N^{\rm mix} + T_\epsilon N^2\big] \;\le\; 1 \;-\; e^{-N[V(\mathcal{O})+2\epsilon]} \;+\; 2^{-\ell\, N}\;.$$

Iterating this estimate M times, gives by the Markov property that

$$\max_{\xi\in\Omega_N} \mathbb{P}_\xi\Big[H_N > M\big\{\ell\, N\, T_N^{\rm mix} + T_\epsilon N^2\big\}\Big] \;\le\; \Big(1 \;-\; e^{-N[V(\mathcal{O})+2\epsilon]} \;+\; 2^{-\ell\, N}\Big)^M\;.$$

Taking ℓ large enough and setting $M = \exp\{N[V(\mathcal{O}) + 2\epsilon]\}$, we conclude that

$$\limsup_{N} \max_{\xi\in\Omega_N} \mathbb{P}_\xi\Big[H_N > e^{N[V(\mathcal{O})+2\epsilon]}\,\big\{\ell\, N\, T_N^{\rm mix} + T_\epsilon N^2\big\}\Big] \;<\; 1\;.$$

Since, by assumption, $N\, T_N^{\rm mix} < \exp\{\epsilon N\}$ for N sufficiently large and since we assumed that $H_N/\mathbb{E}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}[H_N]$ converges to a mean one exponential random variable, we have that

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty} \frac{e^{N[V(\mathcal{O})+3\epsilon]}}{\mathbb{E}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}[H_N]} \;>\; 0\;.$$

Conversely, for $k \ge 0$, let $\mathfrak{A}_k = \{u \in D([kT_\epsilon, (k+1)T_\epsilon], \mathcal{M}) : u(t) \in \mathcal{O}$ for some $kT_\epsilon \le t \le (k+1)T_\epsilon\}$. By definition, for every $L \ge 1$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big[H_N \le L\, N^2\, T_\epsilon\big] \;\le\; \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \mathbb{P}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big[\pi^N \in \mathfrak{A}_k\big] \;\le\; L\, \mathbb{P}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big[\pi^N \in \overline{\mathfrak{A}}\big]\;,$$

where $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}_0$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{A}}$ stands for the closure of $\mathfrak{A}$.

By Theorem 4.5,

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big[\pi^N \in \overline{\mathfrak{A}}\big] \;\le\; -\inf_{u\in\overline{\mathfrak{A}}}\big\{I_{[0,T_\epsilon]}(u|u_0) + V(u_0)\big\}\;.$$

By Lemma 4.1, we may restrict the supremum to paths u in $C([0,T_\epsilon],\mathcal{M})$. In this case, $\overline{\mathfrak{A}}$ is contained on the closed set $\mathfrak{A}' = \{u \in C([0,T_\epsilon],\mathcal{M}) : u(t) \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}$ for some $0 \le t \le T_\epsilon\}$, so that

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big[\pi^N \in \overline{\mathfrak{A}}\big] \;\le\; -\inf_{u\in\mathfrak{A}'} \big\{ I_{[0,T_\epsilon]}(u|u_0) + V(u_0)\big\}\;.$$

By Lemma 4.6, $\inf_{u\in\mathfrak{A}'} \big\{ I_{[0,T_\epsilon]}(u|u_0) + V(u_0)\big\} \ge \inf_{\rho\in\overline{\mathcal{O}}} V(\rho)$ and this latter quantity is by assumption equal to $\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{O}} V(\rho)$. Hence, there exists N_0 such that for all $N \ge N_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big[\pi^N \in \overline{\mathfrak{A}}\big] \;\le\; \exp -N\big\{ \inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{O}} V(\rho) - \epsilon\big\}\;.$$

Taking $L = (1/2)\exp N\big\{V(\mathcal{O}) - \epsilon\big\}$ we deduce from the previous estimates that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}\big[H_N \le (1/2) e^{N\{V(\mathcal{O})-\epsilon\}}\, N^2\, T_\epsilon\big] \;\le\; 1/2$$

for N sufficiently large. Since, by assumption, $H_N/E_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}[H_N]$ converges in distribution to a mean one exponential random variable, we conclude from this inequality that

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{e^{N\{V(\mathcal{O})-2\epsilon\}}}{\mathbb{E}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}[H_N]} \;<\; \infty\;.$$

□

5. Hitting times of rare events in BDSSEP

We prove in this section Theorem 2.1. Denote by $R_N(\eta,\xi)$ the rate at which the BDSSEP $\eta(t)$ jumps from η to ξ. Recall from (2.1) the distance d introduced in $\mathcal{M}$. With this choice, by Schwarz inequality,

$$d(\gamma,\gamma') \;\le\; \|\gamma-\gamma'\|_2\;, \tag{5.1}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ stands for the L_2 norm.

Lemma 5.1. *Fix an open subset $\mathcal{O}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ such that $d(\bar\rho,\mathcal{O}) > 0$. Denote by A_N the set of configurations in Ω_N for which $\pi^N(\eta)$ belongs to $\mathcal{O}$: $A_N = \{\eta \in \Omega_N : \pi^N(\eta) \in \mathcal{O}\}$. Then, there exists $a > 0$ such that*

$$r_N(A^c_N, A_N) \;\le\; e^{-aN} \quad \text{and} \quad \nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}(A_N) \;\le\; e^{-aN}$$

for N sufficiently large.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{O}_\delta$ is the closed set defined by $\mathcal{O}_\delta = \{\gamma\in\mathcal{M} : d(\gamma,\overline{\mathcal{O}}) \le \delta\}$, $\delta > 0$. We claim that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{\gamma\in\mathcal{O}_\delta} V(\gamma) \;>\; 0\;. \tag{5.2}$$

Indeed, let $2\delta = d(\bar\rho,\mathcal{O}) > 0$. It is clear from the definition of $\mathcal{O}_\delta$ that $d(\bar\rho,\gamma) \ge \delta$ for all $\gamma\in\mathcal{O}_\delta$. On the other hand, by [9, Theorem A.1],

$$V(\rho) \;\ge\; \int_0^1 \Big\{ \rho(\mathbf{x}) \log\frac{\rho(\mathbf{x})}{\bar\rho(\mathbf{x})} + [1-\rho(\mathbf{x})] \log\frac{[1-\rho(\mathbf{x})]}{[1-\bar\rho(\mathbf{x})]}\Big\}\, d\mathbf{x}\;.$$

Therefore, since $0 < \alpha \le \bar\rho(x) \le \beta < 1$ and in view of (5.1), there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that for all $\gamma\in\mathcal{O}_\delta$,

$$V(\gamma) \;\ge\; c_0 \int_0^1 \big\{\gamma(\mathbf{x}) - \bar\rho(\mathbf{x})\big\}^2\, d\mathbf{x} \;\ge\; c_0\, d(\gamma,\bar\rho)^2 \;\ge\; c_0\,\delta^2\;.$$

Denote by ∂A_N the outer boundary of A_N:

$$\partial A_N \;=\; \bigcup_{x=1}^{N-2} \{\xi \notin A_N : \sigma^{x,x+1}\xi \in A_N\} \bigcup_{z=1,N-1} \{\xi \notin A_N : \sigma^{z}\xi \in A_N\}\;.$$

Since $\sum_{\xi\in\Omega_N} R_N(\eta,\xi) \le N$, by definition of the average rate $r_N(A_N^c, A_N)$,

$$r_N(A_N^c, A_N) \;\le\; \frac{1}{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}(A_N^c)}\, N\, \nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}(\partial A_N)\;.$$

It is clear that for each $\delta > 0$, $\partial A_N \subset \{\eta \in \Omega_N : \pi^N(\eta) \in \mathcal{O}_\delta\}$ for N large enough. Hence, by Theorem 4.3 and by (5.2), there exists $a > 0$ such that

$$\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}(\partial A_N) \;\le\; \nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}(\pi^N \in \mathcal{O}_\delta) \;\le\; e^{-aN}$$

for N sufficiently large. The same bound holds for A_N, which proves the first part of the lemma. □

Estimation of the mixing time in the BDSSEP. We show in this subsection by a coupling argument that

$$T_N^{\rm mix} \;\le\; (1/2)N^3\;. \tag{5.3}$$

This bound is not sharp but sufficient for our purposes.

Assume that a coupling (η_t, ξ_t) has been defined in the product space $\Omega_N \times \Omega_N$. This means that both coordinates evolve has the original BDSSEP and that the pair does not leave the diagonal once it reaches it. We denote by $\mathbb{P}_{\eta,\xi}$ the distribution of the coupling when the initial configuration is (η,ξ). Denote by $H_{\mathbb{D}}$ the coupling time, the time the process reaches the diagonal. It is well known that

$$T_N^{\rm mix} \;\le\; \inf\big\{t : \max_{\eta,\xi\in\Omega_N} \mathbb{P}_{\eta,\xi}[H_{\mathbb{D}} \ge t] \le 1/4\big\}\;.$$

The coupling of two copies of the BDSSEP is defined as follows. Fix two configurations η, ξ in Ω_N. We assume that the particles evolve according to a stirring dynamics and that particles are created simultaneously in both coordinates at the boundary. In particular, the coupled process has reached the diagonal when all initial particles have left the system. Denote by H_j the time the particle initially at $j \in \Lambda_N$ leaves the system. If there are no particles at j set $H_j = 0$ and note that if j is occupied by an η-particle and a ξ-particle they both leave the system at the same time due to the stirring dynamics. With this notation, $H_{\mathbb{D}} \le \max_j H_j$ and for all $t > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\eta,\xi}[H_{\mathbb{D}} \ge t] \;\le\; \sum_{j\in\Lambda_N} \mathbb{P}_{\eta,\xi}[H_j \ge t]\;.$$

Under the stirring dynamics, the particle at j performs a symmetric random walk until it reaches the boundary. If we denote by $H_\dagger$ the hitting time of the boundary, it is known that $\mathbf{E}_j[H_\dagger] = (1/2)j(N-j) \le N^2/8$. The previous sum is thus bounded by $N^3/8t$, which proves claim (5.3).

Proof of Theorem 2.1. The first assertion of the proposition follows from Lemma 5.1, (5.3) and Theorem 3.1. The second one follows from Theorem 4.4.

To prove the third assertion, let $\gamma_N = N^4$ and consider the enlarged process associated to this sequence. By (5.3) and by the second assertion of the theorem, $T_N^{\rm mix} \ll \gamma_N^{-1} \ll \mathbb{E}_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}[H_{\mathcal{O}}]$.

Since $d\mu_N/d\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta} = \mathbf{1}\{\eta \in B_N\}\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}(B_N)^{-1}$, $E_{\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}}[(d\mu_N/d\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta})^2] = \nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}(B_N)^{-1}$. Hence, as $R_N(\eta,\Omega_N) \le N$, the expression appearing on the left hand side of (3.10) is bounded by $N^5\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}(A_N)/\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}(B_N)$. By the static large deviation principle,

$$\limsup \frac{1}{N}\log \nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}(A_N) \;\le\; \limsup \frac{1}{N}\log \nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}(\pi^N \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}) \;\le\; -\inf_{\gamma\in\overline{\mathcal{O}}} V(\gamma)\;,$$

$$\liminf \frac{1}{N}\log \nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}(B_N) \;\ge\; \liminf \frac{1}{N}\log \nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}(\pi^N \in \mathcal{B}^o) \;\ge\; -\inf_{\gamma\in\mathcal{B}^o} V(\gamma)\;.$$

Therefore, by assumption (2.5), $N^5\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}(A_N)/\nu^N_{\alpha,\beta}(B_N)$ vanishes as $N \uparrow \infty$. By remark (3.10), condition (3.9) is fulfilled. By Lemma 5.1 and by (5.3), the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 are in force. The third assertion of the theorem follows therefore from Corollary 3.6. □

Acknowledgments. This problem was formulated to the second author by A. Galves after a talk on nonequilibrium stationary states at NUMEC-USP. The authors would like to thank A. Asselah and E. Scoppola for fruitfull discussions.

References

[1] D. Aldous: Markov chains with almost exponential hitting times, Stochastic. Proc. Appl. **13**, 305-310 (1982).

[2] D. Aldous, M. Brown: Inequalities for rare events in time reversible Markov chains I, in Stochastic Inequalities, M. Shaked and Y. L. Tong eds., pp. 1–16, Lecture Notes of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics, vol. 22 (1992).

[3] D. Aldous, M. Brown: Inequalities for rare events in time reversible Markov chains II, Stochastic Proc. Appl. **44**, 15-25 (1993).

[4] A. Asselah and P. Dai Pra: Sharp estimates for occurrence time of rare events for simple symmetric exclusion, Stochastic Process. Appl. **71**, 259–273 (1997)

[5] A. Asselah and P. Dai Pra: First occurrence time of a large density fluctuation for a system of independent random walks Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. **36**, 367–393 (2000)

[6] J. Barrera, O. Bertoncini and R. Fernández: Abrupt Convergence and Escape Behavior for Birth and Death Chains. J. Stat. Phys. **137**, 595–623 (2009).

[7] J. Beltrán, C. Landim: Tunneling and metastability of continuous time Markov chains II. J. Stat. Phys. **149**, 598–618 (2012).

[8] J. Beltrán, C. Landim: A martingale approach to metastability. In preparation (2013).

[9] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio and C. Landim: Large Deviations for the Boundary Driven Symmetric Simple Exclusion Process. Math. Phys. Anal. Geom. **6**, 231-267 (2003).

[10] Bertini L., Landim C., Mourragui M.: Dynamical large deviations for the boundary driven weakly asymmetric exclusion process. Ann. Probab. **37**, 2357-2403 (2009).

[11] A. Bianchi, A. Gaudillière: Metastable states, quasi-stationary and soft measures, mixing time asymptotics via variational principles. arXiv:1103.1143 (2011)

[12] T. Bodineau and G. Giacomin: From Dynamic to Static Large Deviations in boundary Driven Exclusion Particle Systems, Stoch. Proc. Appl. **110**, 67-81 (2004).

[13] M. Brown: Error bounds for exponential approximations of geometric convolution, Ann. Probab. **18**, 1388-1402 (1990).

[14] M. Brown: Interlacing eigenvalues in time reversible Markov chains, Math. Oper. Res. **24**, 847-864 (1999).

[15] Donsker M. D., Varadhan S. R. S., *Large Deviations from a hydrodynamic scaling limit.* Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **42** 243–270. (1989)

[16] Eyink G., Lebowitz J. L., Spohn H., *Hydrodynamics of stationary nonequilibrium states for some lattice gas models.* Commun. Math. Phys. **132**, 253–283 (1990).

[17] Eyink G., Lebowitz J.L., Spohn H., *Lattice gas models in contact with stochastic reservoirs: local equilibrium and relaxation to the steady state.* Commun. Math. Phys. **140**, 119–131 (1991).

[18] J. Farfan: Static large deviations of boundary driven exclusion processes arXiv:0908.1798 (2009).
[19] J. Farfan, C. Landim, M. Mourragui: Hydrostatics and dynamical large deviations of boundary driven gradient symmetric exclusion processes. Stochastic Process. Appl. **121** 725–758 (2011).
[20] R. Fernandez, F. Manzo, F. R. Nardi and E. Scoppola, private communication.
[21] P. A. Ferrari, J. A. Galves, C. Landim; Exponential waiting time for a big gap in a one dimensional zero range process, Ann. Probab., **22**, 284–288, (1994).
[22] P. A. Ferrari, J. A. Galves, T. Liggett; Exponential waiting time for filling a big gap in the symmetric simple exclusion process. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré, Probabilités **31**, 155–175 (1995)
[23] J. A. Fill and V. Lyzinski: Hitting times and interlacing eigenvalues: a stochastic approach using intertwinings, arKiv:1201.6441v2.
[24] A. Gaudillière, C. Landim: A Dirichlet principle for non reversible Markov chains and some recurrence theorems. To appear in Probab. Th. Rel. Fields arXiv:1111.2445 (2011).
[25] R. Imbuzeiro Oliveira: Mean field conditions for coalescing random walks arXiv:1109.5684v2. To appear in Ann. Probab. (2011)
[26] J. Keilson: Markov Chain Models–Rarity and Exponentiality, Springer-Verlag (1979).
[27] Kipnis C., Landim C., Olla S., *Macroscopic properties of a stationary non-equilibrium distribution for a non-gradient interacting particle system.* Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré, Probabilités **31**, 191–221 (1995).
[28] C. Kipnis, S. Olla, S.R.S. Varadhan: *Hydrodynamics and large deviations for simple exclusion processes.* Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **42**, 115–137 (1989).

CNRS UMR 6085, Université de Rouen, Avenue de l'Université, BP.12, Technopôle du Madrillet, F76801 Saint-Étienne-du-Rouvray, France.
e-mail: `olivier.benois@univ-rouen.fr`

IMPA, Estrada Dona Castorina 110, CEP 22460 Rio de Janeiro, Brasil.
e-mail: `brunog@impa.br`

IMPA, Estrada Dona Castorina 110, CEP 22460 Rio de Janeiro, Brasil and CNRS UMR 6085, Université de Rouen, Avenue de l'Université, BP.12, Technopôle du Madrillet, F76801 Saint-Étienne-du-Rouvray, France.
e-mail: `landim@impa.br`

CNRS UMR 6085, Université de Rouen, Avenue de l'Université, BP.12, Technopôle du Madrillet, F76801 Saint-Étienne-du-Rouvray, France.
e-mail: `mustapha.mourragui@univ-rouen.fr`